

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-6786

RASHID QAWI AL-AMIN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

GENE JOHNSON, in his official capacity; LINDA SHEAR, in her individual and official capacities; RUFUS FLEMING, in his individual and official capacities; G. P. WILLIAMS, in his individual and official capacities; S. J. ADVENT, in his individual and official capacities; S. BAYLOR, in his individual and official capacities; D. M. FERGUSON, in his/her individual and official capacities; M. L. POPE, in his individual and official capacities; MR. FERROW, in his individual and official capacities; CHARLIE DAVIS, in his individual and official capacities; BLAINE BROCK, Food Service Manager, an employee of Compass Group USA, Inc. d/b/a Canteen Correctional Services; CLYDE ALDERMAN, in his individual and official capacities,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District Judge. (2:04-cv-00346-RAJ)

Submitted: November 18, 2010Decided: November 30, 2010

Before SHEDD and AGEE, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Rashid Qawi Al-Amin, Appellant Pro Se. Mark R. Davis, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia; Paul Graham Beers, GLENN, FELDMANN, DARBY & GOODLATTE, Roanoke, Virginia; Peter M. Coppinger, Gregory D. Cote, MCCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP, Boston, Massachusetts, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Rashid Qawi Al-Amin seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing one of the defendants as a party. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2006), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2006); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). The order Al-Amin seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED